



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/030,419	01/10/2002	Stefan Blomgren	HPX0072-PCT	8781

28970 7590 07/25/2005

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

LOWE, MICHAEL S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3652

DATE MAILED: 07/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/030,419	Applicant(s) BLOMGREN ET AL.	
	Examiner M. Scott Lowe	Art Unit 3652	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2 and 4-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 10-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2, 5-9 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Election/Restrictions

Claims 4,10-16 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 8/26/03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Davis (US 5,483,876).

Re claim 18, see figure 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2,17-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller (DE 9417837) in view of Davis (US 5,483,876).

Re claims 2,17-21, Muller teaches a method for rapid transfer of a work object in both the horizontal and vertical directions using a robot unit having a gripping mechanism 20, the workpiece weighing between one kilo and forty kilos. The object is transferred in the horizontal direction 1 to 10 meters along a beam member 12; the robot 14 controlled by a control unit and driven by a single belt 22 and at least 2 motors 32, 40 comprising rotor unit connected to the drive wheels; the motors immovably arranged in relation to workstations (not numbered) and transfer of the work object done without displacement of the motors; the movement along a pre-programmed path monitored and controlled continuously through registration of the situation of each of the rotors forming part of the motors. Muller is silent on moving a work object beyond the beam end situation, intermediate table and simultaneous transfer. However, Davis teaches a similar device handling an object beyond an end situation and wherein the gripping mechanism 10 moves along the beam and is arranged with at least two gripping units 48,48,52,52 a first gripping unit collecting the work object from the first position and a second gripping unit depositing the work object in a second position beyond a second end situation along the beams each of the first and second gripping units collecting and placing objects simultaneously with the other unit, wherein an intermediate storage 54 for change of place of the work object is effected before the work object is transferred from the first position to the second position, and wherein the first gripping unit collects the work object from the first position and deposits the work object at the intermediate storage and the second gripping unit collects the work object from the intermediate storage and deposits the work object in the second position in

Art Unit: 3652

order speed up production (summary of the invention). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Muller by Davis to handle an object beyond an end situation and wherein the gripping mechanism moves along the beam and is arranged with at least two gripping units, a first gripping unit collecting the work object from the first position and a second gripping unit depositing the work object in a second position beyond a second end situation along the beams each of the first and second gripping units collecting and placing objects simultaneously with the other unit, wherein an intermediate storage for change of place of the work object is effected before the work object is transferred from the first position to the second position, and wherein the first gripping unit collects the work object from the first position and deposits the work object at the intermediate storage and the second gripping unit collects the work object from the intermediate storage and deposits the work object in the second position in order speed up production.

Claims 5-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Muller (DE 9417837) in view of Davis (US 5,483,876) and Dixon (US 3,958,740).

Re claims 5-7, Muller is silent on a "teach-in process" but Dixon teaches a "teach-in process" (column 3, 2nd paragraph from bottom) to allow to for easier programming (column 4, paragraph 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Muller by Dixon to have a "teach-in process" to allow to for easier programming.

Re claim 8, Muller as already modified by Davis teaches having multiple grippers.

Re claim 9, Muller as already modified by Davis teaches having an intermediate table 54.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Kato (US 4,509,638) teaches a device similar to applicant's device.

Bennington (US 4,921,387) teaches a device similar to applicant's device.

Shiraishi (US 5,148,697) teaches a similar device similar to applicant's device.

Shiraishi (US 4,941,793) teaches a similar device similar to applicant's device.

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 3652

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Scott Lowe whose telephone number is (571) 272-6929. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am-4:30pm M-Th.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eileen Lillis can be reached on (571) 272-6607. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

msl
msl

Donald W. Underwood 7/18/05
RONALD W. UNDERWOOD
PRIMARY EXAMINER